Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

contain at least one page of statistics in such form as to admit of easy comparison. This should not interfere with the free statistical arrangement of other parts of the report. It is desired by most libraries to maintain their own forms in order that comparisons with their own past years may be easy.

We are of opinion that the form called Form II, to be found on page 150 of the 1906 report, is essentially what is needed for our purposes, but we are not yet agreed on certain slight modifications which appear necessary to bring it up to date. The general form of the blank, based as it was on correspondence with many libraries and library commissions, is excellent.

We therefore ask for additional time and hope to be able to make a full report in January next.

We desire to call attention to the fact that some way must be devised of keeping this matter before the minds of librarians. The fact that the 1906 report, full as it is and embodying so many specific recommendations, should have completely passed from the memory of so many librarians is significant. We desire to suggest the following plan in the hope that some discussion of it may help to shape our final report:

Let this Committee, in its annual report hereafter, embody a table of statistics of American libraries based on its own recommended form, and let this include only such libraries as give a page, in this form, in their annual reports. We are of the opinion that a desire to be included in this comparative table may act as an inducement to libraries to do the slight additional work necessary.

(Signed) ARTHUR E. BOSTWICK,
Chairman.

The last feature of the report was discussed at length, the sense of the Council being that as soon as possible the committee should secure promises from at least 100 librarians to use the recommended form of statistics. The form, as decided upon, should be applicable not only to municipal tax-supported libraries, but to others, reference and especially endowed libraries as well.

Mr. Roden presented resolutions of appreciation of services rendered by the Library of Congress to the libraries of the country, which had been adopted by the Catalog Section, and it was voted that they be referred to the Resolutions committee, with the approval of the Council.

Adjourned.

AGRICULTURAL LIBRARIES SECTION

The meeting of the Agricultural Libraries Section took place on Tuesday afternoon in the small ballroom of the New Willard and was presided over by the chairman of the section, Miss Claribel R. Barnett, librarian of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. "Some opportunities and problems of the agricultural libraries" was the general subject of the meeting, which was opened with remarks by the chairman, in which she said in part:

That there are problems peculiar to agricultural libraries which could be better settled by closer coöperation of these libraries was one of the principal reasons for the establishment of the section. As far as rural library work is concerned there was perhaps no reason for the Agricultural Libraries Section, as this work was already being given much thoughtful attention by the various state library commissions. There did, however, seem to be a need of some impetus to arouse a greater interest in the opportunities for usefulness presented to the libraries of the agricultural colleges and experiment stations. A good many of the state agricultural colleges and experiment stations are not yet giving to their libraries the attention which they deserve. Their equipment in other respects is far ahead of their library equipment, and in many instances they have attached little importance to the necessity of having an experienced, well-trained librarian. They are spending large sums of money for their scientific investigations, and yet have not apparently realized that there is often danger of spending money on misdirected and needless efforts simply because they have not adequate facilities for finding out what has been done. When business firms employ librarians, it can be taken for granted that they know it is a good business investment. There are still many of the agricultural colleges and stations which need to be convinced that it would pay them to give more attention to their libraries, both as regards equipment and service. If the colleges and stations should provide better equipment for their libraries, should not the librarians of these libraries in turn make every effort to improve their efficiency? Is the Agricultural Libraries Section one means of promoting it? There is without doubt a benefit in being brought in closer touch with librarians doing similar work, but is this the only benefit to be derived from this section? Can it not be a means for carrying on certain coöperative undertakings which would be helpful to all agricultural libraries? Can it work out any standard administrative policies for agricultural college and experiment station libraries? Can it do anything to make the literature of agriculture more available? Can it bring about a closer relationship between the libraries of the agricultural colleges and experiment stations and the Department of Agriculture? Can it do anything to minimize waste of work and waste of money in these institutions? Can the section in fact do anything toward increasing the good results from the sum total of the money available for agricultural libraries given by the various states and the federal government? These are questions to be considered and it is hoped that there will be a frank expression of opinion at this meeting on all of them. If we stop to think about the libraries of the state agricultural colleges and experiment stations we cannot help but be struck by the fact that they are in certain respects unique and that there is or could be a very strong bond of union among them. They are all connected with institutions receiving federal aid and federal supervision. In addition, these institutions all exhibit great uniformity in organization; they are all working for the same end, are publishing the same kind of material, and they have the same problems. A recent editorial in the Experiment Station Record has called attention to the fact that in spite of this close connection of the agricultural colleges and experiment stations there has been an almost utter lack of coöperation and coordination among their libraries, and that "as a result we have a group of more than fifty libraries interested in identical lines of literature, striving independently with more or less zeal to collect and file publications of similar character, each ignorant of the resources of the others and too frequently ignorant of all the resources apart from its own meagre collection of books, periodicals and official documents."

Dean Davenport, in a recent address on the relations between the federal Department of Agriculture and the agricultural colleges and experiment stations, made a strong plea for division of labor as against coöperation, but does not a division of labor involve coöperation? In library work has not coöperation come to mean not merely combined work on certain undertakings but also a mutual understanding and agreement as to the objects to be accomplished and the means of accomplishing them, which agreement often involves a division of labor? As far as the agricultural libraries are concerned there are certain undertakings which would in the more restricted sense of the word be coöperative, involving as they would necessarily the participation of all the agricultural colleges and experiment stations. Then there are other undertakings which can be coöperative in the sense that the different libraries might agree to do certain things and not do certain other things. Coöperative book buying is an undertaking of this kind. To conserve funds, would it, for instance, be possible for the library of one college or station to specialize along one particular line and for the college or station library of a neighboring state to specialize along a different line, with the understanding that they would lend their books as freely as possible? The resources of the Department of Agriculture library should also be borne in mind. Probably there are few libraries that have not been subjected to the criticism of having on their shelves many books which are never or seldom used. It is a criticism which cannot lightly be ignored, even though it is extremely difficult to avoid, but are not the increased facilities for inter-library loans and the increased knowledge of the resources of other libraries doing a great deal to bring about more systematic and intelligent planning in the building up of collections? There are certain large libraries which have come to be recognized as the great depositories in their special field, not only for the new and up-to-date books frequently called for, but also for the old out-of-date literature of use only to the investigators making a historical survey of a subject. Such libraries can justify the existence on their shelves of the books seldom used, if they come within the recognized scope of the library, by reason of their value for historical purposes, but the library of limited means needs to choose and reject with great care. Do we not sometimes go to infinite pains to complete a set of some periodical, whereas it might be better to contribute our partial set toward the completion of some incomplete set in some other library? The literature of agriculture is most extensive and the funds of no agricultural library are unlimited. Cannot the sum total of the funds be made to bring far greater results through an increased knowledge of the existing resources and by some co-operation in future purchases? Such co-operation may not be practicable but it is at least worthy of some thought.

In the field of indexing agricultural literature are we doing all we should, or in the evaluation of agricultural literature? Then again, have not we who have worked with agricultural literature and the related sciences, felt the desirability of some systematic course of instruction in this special field of library work? But have we made any attempt to bring about such a course? In the field of extension work in agriculture, which work is growing very rapidly and is likely to grow still more rapidly in the future, now that the Lever bill is passed, are the librarians of agricultural libraries doing their full share?

The next paper on the program was one on the "Scope and current cost of libraries in the land grant agricultural colleges," by Professor WILLIAM H. POWERS, librarian of the South Dakota State College of Agriculture. As Professor Powers was unable to be present, his paper was read by Mr. Charles R. Green, librarian of the Massachusetts Agricultural College.

SCOPE AND CURRENT COST OF LIBRARIES IN THE LAND GRANT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES*

The conclusions of this paper are based partly upon the personal experience of the writer, partly upon data supplied by various college libraries.

It was not the writer's expectation that results could be arrived at having the certainty of scientific laws. But conclusions of a validity far short of such laws may have a considerable practical value. The examination was undertaken therefore because for some years the writer has been himself a good deal puzzled, puzzled as he contemplated the enormous output of books, fortunately known to him largely through publishers' lists and statistics, puzzled as he felt the ambition that attacks every growing thing, whether library or squash, the ambition to be big, puzzled as he saw the great amount of the people's money stored up in great buildings, shelving, and cabinets, puzzled what to do as he joined the great army of those who are paid by the people to take care of these buildings and these books; and he felt that he must find what solution of the puzzle he could by asking whether there is not some limit to the size of a library, particularly of a special or technical library, whether there are not some standards of service which may be invoked to determine how large a staff a library of a certain size needs, and what should be the cost of that service.

---

*Printed in part.

The investigation is confined to the libraries of those land grant colleges that exist apart from a state university. Such libraries serve the experiment station, the college staff, the college students, and, to a certain extent, the state at large and the immediate community. There is need then of providing technical literature sufficient for research work in agriculture and engineering, professional literature to support courses in all the sciences and in such departments, history, language, sociology, as it is deemed necessary to provide that the technical student may not be deprived of his culture birthright as a man as well as a technician. I interpret this to mean then that the library must be (a) a fairly good general library, (b) a good reference library in those courses which the college offers, and (c) as complete a working library as possible for those lines of research which the particular institution is carrying on.

For the first of these requirements is there any standard? None absolute, of course not. But it seems to me that the A. L. A. Catalog furnishes an approximation. About 8,000 volumes constitute this coöperative selection, this ideal collection for the small general library. Now the amount of fiction in this collection is much larger than any small technical college needs, and for this may be substituted those books which a college public as distinguished from a general public would demand.

For research work in agriculture the works of reference are amply provided through the agency of the Department of Agriculture. These consist primarily of the bulletins and reports of the department and of the various stations. They will make perhaps 100 small volumes each year. Many states also publish annual reports or bulletins on geology and natural history. In most of the states there are published reports of societies, agricultural, horticultural, and the like. The cost for most of this material is only for its care and binding. There are besides a few technical journals, proceedings of societies, and the like, that are not free. For the work in engineering, library equipment is much more costly, as, except trade journals, little of it is published free. It is largely found in periodicals. The library of the Department of Agriculture offers to lend its material to investigators. So far as I know this offer is not very largely accepted. It would seem as if there might very profitably be an increase in the use of such a central and complete collection and that a similar collection of material on engineering might be made.

Excluding from the aim of the agricultural library the idea of completeness in the general collection, and even from its special field the complete collection of the slightly used works of great cost, and the assemblage of vast numbers of books dead to all except the student of the history of a special field of thought, the annual expenditure for books and periodicals need not be very great, and furthermore it should be, after a library gets a fair equipment, tolerably constant. I am not rash enough to say what that constant sum should be; moreover it would be constant only for a particular institution, and then only for an approximately constant number of students. But as there is nothing like definiteness for precipitating discussion I am going to venture a suggestion. For annual up-keep of a library in an agricultural college, attended say by 300 to 400 students of college grade and perhaps as many more of secondary school rank—

not summer school students—there will be needed the following sums:

Scientific series, monographs, expensive works	$300.00
Technical periodicals, scientific journals	400.00
General periodicals	125.00
Binding	300.00
General purchase of books	675.00
	$1,800.00

Even a single illustration or example is often more convincing than generalization. As to the unwisdom of the purchase of books rarely used and originally expensive, note this example: We purchased six years ago, on urgent request, a small book at the cost of $9.00; it was used then and has since been referred to once. The interest on the $9.00 is about a half-dollar, for six years $3.00. The book could have been borrowed twice for less than 50 cents, a saving of $2.50, to say nothing of the cost of shelving and care. It is now very much depreciated in value, probably two-thirds, because of the changes in that field of investigation. In a few years more it will have a value solely historic.

Perhaps at this point is the most opportune moment for presenting the tables of statistics. We shall thus see how much of diversity, how much of agreement there actually is among the twenty-five colleges of agriculture not connected directly with a university. Replies were received from a little over half the number written to. Several bases of classification suggest themselves; as most obvious, I have selected the number of students as a basis; with a large number usually goes a larger library staff and a relatively more important amount of station work; of this last matter I have made no account at all, though I have always had in mind that as research work increases, the relative cost of library equipment, especially in rare sets and serial publications, increases much more rapidly.

Before making the division, I was somewhat puzzled whether to regard the whole number of students or only those of college grade. Remembering how important in our work are the boys and girls who go back to the farm, I felt that it was better to consider the whole number of students, excluding, however, those in the summer sessions.

The following tables include returns from thirteen colleges reporting and from the South Dakota State College of Agriculture. In these tables I have not given the names of the colleges, as one of the librarians objected to the publication of the statistics; I have therefore used letters, arranging the colleges in the order of students in the institution. The figures for attendance and for total income are taken from the report of the Commissioner of Education for 1912. The other statistics are from the replies sent to me by the librarians.

The groups on the basis of number of students are four, the points of division of course more or less arbitrary; the first group, having 1,700 students or more, numbers five altogether, only three of them reporting and represented in the tables; the second, having students in number between 900 and 1,700, numbers seven altogether, five of them reporting; the third, having students from 350 to 900, numbers seven, three reporting; the fourth, having students fewer than 350, six in number, two reporting. The first group may be named the great colleges; in general they have a large corps of instructors, and presumably a large library staff. The second group, the large colleges, also employs a large number of instructors; the library staff varies from three to eight. The third group may be called perhaps the small colleges; the library staff in none of those reporting exceeds three. The smallest of the third group reports 390 students in the 1912 report, but actually has now about 600 students.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE LIBRARIES—TABLE I.

		Students U. S. Rep. 1912		Expenditures				Salaries			
		Total, ex. sum. sch.	Col. grade	Bks.	Per.	Bnd.	Per Student	Libr.	Ass't	Stud. help	Total
I	A	2,634	809	$8,234*		$ 266	$3.23	$1,600	$3,200	$260	$5,100
	B	2,424	1,504	4,900†			2.02	1,300	5,300	540	7,140
	B½	1,700	1,176	3,800†			2.24	1,100	700	c200	2,000
II	C	1,371	891	3,027	$1,251	1,390	4.13	2,000	5,200	200	7,140
	D	1,219	889‡	1,447	340	185	1.62—	1,500	1,200	257	2,957
	E	1,219	327	1,800†			1.49	1,400	960	90	2,450
	F	1,216	190	1,250	532	180	1.61	1,400	1,620	125	3,045
	G	910	506	1,896	2,004	1,050	5,44—	1,800	2,730	264	4,794
III	H	850	322	2,000†			2.34	1,300	1,600	40	2,940
	I	811	716‡	900	200	200	1.62	700	625		1,325
	J	490	410‡	462	250	39	1.53	780	840	150	1,620
	K	390	184	723	240	202	2.99	800§	500	225	1,525
IV	L	332	55	600	403	349	4.07	1,000	600		1,600
	M	322	229	1,200	500	500	6.83	1,000	6,000		1,600

*For bks. and per. †For bks. per. and bnd. ‡Admits from 10th grade or lower. §Excludes salary for teaching.

TABLE II.

		Salary cost per st.	Library cost per st.	No. of volumes total	per st.	Income of col.	Income per student	Proportion of income used for lib.
I	A	$1.94	$5.16	20,000	7.6—	$410,391	$156	.033
	B	2.94	4.97	45,000	18.5	786,025	326	.016
	B½	1.18	3.41	38,201	21.8	449,008	264	.013—
II	C	5.40	9.53	38,141	27.8	382,240	279	.034
	D	2.13	3.75	19,631	16.1	288,666	327	.016
	E	2.01	3.49	26,000	21.3	244,188	200	.017
	F	2.50	3.49	24,610	20.2	227,487	187	.022
	G	5.27	10.7	42,000	46.1	354,603	390	.027
III	H	3.41	5.81	34,320	40.4	218,975	257	.022
	I	1.65	3.24—	17,000	20.9	165,156	204	.015
	J	3.30	4.82	14,297	29.2	204,459	417	.012
	K	3.91	6.83	17,000	43.6	175,005	449	.016
IV	L	4.82	8.89	16,387	49.3	78,105	235	.038
	M	3.00—	11.8	31,600	98.1	155,040	481	.024

TABLE III.

		Open Hrs.	Vacation a wk.	No. of workers	Organization	Hrs. of serv. per wk.	Teaching hrs. a wk.
I	A	69	45	6 or 7	Cat. 34 hrs., Bnd. and con. 38 hrs.	42	8—11, ½ yr.
	B	76	6	9	2 cat. 1 ref. 2 loan, 2 dept. ast.	39, 44	4, ½ yr.
II	C	88	2 1 mo	8	Cat. 63 hrs., circ. 126 hrs., ref. 84 hrs.	42	4, 9 wks.
	D	49*	36*	3		49½	0
	E	45—50	3—6	3		30	2—4
	F	57	40½	4		38—45½	14 for yr. total
	G	84*	48*	6	1 cat. 1 Sten. checking, i ref.	44	
III	H	67*	42*	3		42	1
	I	46		2		46	
	J	54		3		36	
	K	70	5—40	3	1 cat. 12 hrs.	40	8—12 pd. sep.
IV	L	44	10	2		40	1 ½ yr.
	M	64	32	2		44½—48½	Fresh

*Figures uncertain, as the number of days a week was not given.

Returning now to the more theoretic considerations with which the paper began, and keeping in mind the great differences in these institutions, more particularly these facts: that several of them have a reputation as authorities in special fields, an authority not ascribed to the most of them, and that a few of them have grown out of the ranks of the small college, I shall go on next, fitting my remarks chiefly to the college of moderate size and modest ambitions, to a consideration of the cost of administration. What should it cost to administer a library in an agricultural college of about 600 students, where about $1,800 is expended annually for books, periodicals, and binding?

The work in such a library may be somewhat variously classified; there is the usual work of catalog, reference, desk, and ordering. The peculiarities of the institution served, however, make the desk work of relatively less importance than in the public library, the general reference work probably less than in the ordinary college library, and put a special stress on the care of documents and various serial publications.

Although these departments of work are generally found in libraries, there does not seem to be any agreement upon the cost of service in each. Our agricultural libraries of course use L. C. cards where possible. It would seem that ten cents a volume would be a generous allowance for the service of the cataloger. In the estimates given above nothing was said about the number of volumes acquired each year with the expenditure of $1,800. To make such an estimate I shall have to draw entirely upon our own experience. I find that for the last three years our books have averaged in cost, excluding the free volumes and the periodicals, $1.48 a volume. Using this as a basis of estimate, the $675 allowed for such purchases would secure about 460 volumes. At an average cost of $5 a volume for the monographs, technical journals, etc., the $700 would procure about 140 volumes. There would probably be 60 volumes of general periodicals bound each year. There will also be from 50 to 75 volumes of bulletins bound. It is hardly fair, however, to include these periodicals and bulletins in the estimate of the cost of cataloging, as so little work needs to be done upon them. The routine cataloging then would not be of more than 600 volumes, to be done at a cost not to exceed $60 for labor. The cataloger will have also to do considerable indexing and analytic work on the bulletins and society publications, unless this is done in the department of documents or continuations.

But what is the work of the documents division? In number of volumes the first in order are the volumes of the congressional set received by every agricultural college as a documents depository. These averaged in number for the past six years 203 bulky volumes. The pamphlets also received that will be preserved, including the bulletins of the Department of Agriculture, will number at least 25 volumes more. Some of these will have to have prepared indexes and title-pages, perhaps analytic entries for the catalog. From the state stations and the state societies and other learned societies, whose publications are received in exchange, will be received about 200 volumes. Here then is a great bulk of material but the work of caring for it is out of all proportion to its bulk. To keep track of serials the follow-up system must often be invoked, requests sent for missing parts, and lists kept showing what have not been secured. Watch must then be kept of lists of such documents as are offered for sale, but this is getting into the work of the ordering department. Such is the work to be done under the head of documents and continuations.

Related to the work of the cataloger, really a part of it, is the constant revision of the catalog, made necessary by the loss of some books, the withdrawal of others, and the deposit of others in departments. Related also is the ordering of the books on the shelves.

The chief remaining library activity is ordering and correspondence. This will ordinarily be done by the librarian; judging from my own experience, the time element is not here important, as the librarian works until he is done.

Resuming, we have found catalog labor amounting to about $60 on new books; a rough estimate of the documents work would put its cost, on the same basis of pay as to the cataloger, at about $100. Of neither kind of work is there enough to employ the full time of an assistant. One assistant can do both and have time for revision of the catalog, and still allow half her hours for desk and reference work. I shall not set an exact salary for such an assistant, but suggest that one can be secured for from $600 to $800 for a year of ten months. This estimate is based partly upon the customary pay of teachers.

The amount of desk work will depend a good deal upon the number of hours the library is open. The average for the thirteen libraries is 63 hours a week. Most of these libraries provide only one attendant on service at a time in the reading and reference room. It would seem that for a college of 600 students, it would be necessary to supply about 70 seats, but the whole number would rarely be needed. The patronage varies greatly; during the busiest hours of the college day, the number drops to almost zero. The busy hours are not always the same every day, but with a little careful observation the librarian can determine which are the library rush hours and provide extra service for such times. There would be probably from 15 to 20 hours a week when two attendants should be provided; if the library is open 63 hours weekly, this necessitates then providing for from 78 to 83 desk hours. Now if the cataloger and document worker has 20 hours for this service, to be given at the busy hours when there is the greatest demand for reference work, the remaining 60-odd hours can be supplied by a second assistant, an apprentice perhaps, at a small salary; or the work can be done by mature students. Three students can do the work, paid in the aggregate from $300 to $325 for the nine months of the college year.

I hesitate to suggest a salary for the librarian. In my own case a large part of my salary comes from teaching duties. I would suggest that for the library work purely, a salary of from $800 to $1,000 will secure a person altogether competent to manage a library in an agricultural college of 600 students.

The salary account would then stand about as follows:

Librarian	$800 to	$1,000
Assistant	600 to	800
Student help	300 to	325
	$1,700 to	$2,125

About other work connected with the library. Colleges of this kind report almost no teaching. In the first two groups, all colleges but two report teaching the use of the library, chiefly to freshmen. Extension work, through lending books to farmers, clubs, or granges, did not appear upon my query paper. It is probably too early to generalize concerning this. Most states now have commissions and the commissions generally prefer to take care of this work directly.

Returning again to the matter of duplicates, we expect to make recommendation —the demand for duplicates has not until recently been burdensome—that every student in classes known as library-laboratory classes shall pay a fee to the librarian before he is allowed the use of the books in that department, the fee to vary from 25 cents to $1.00 a semester according to the number of duplicates needed to supply the course. It seems quite as just as a laboratory fee in chemistry. Has any college done so? With what success?

Professor Powers' paper suggested many interesting points for discussion and showed clearly the possibility, through cooperation, of working out some standards of administration for the libraries of the agricultural colleges and experiment stations. The value of such a standardization was also made apparent. It would simplify many problems in the administration of these libraries. There was, however, considerable difference of opinion among those present as to the adequacy of the salaries recommended by Professor Powers.

Mrs Landon, librarian of the Michigan Agricultural College, in commenting on what Professor Powers had said about borrowing books and periodicals from the library of the Department of Agriculture, said that her library made frequent use of this privilege. She also suggested the desirability of a union checklist of the agricultural periodicals contained in the libraries of the state agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

The next paper on the program was to have been one on "Agricultural periodicals" by Mr. WILLIAM M. HEPBURN, librarian of Purdue University, but Mr. Hepburn was unable to be present and unfortunately his paper, which follows, arrived too late to be read at the meeting:

AGRICULTURAL PERIODICALS

It may be remembered that the writer presented a paper on this subject at the round table on agricultural libraries held at the Mackinac conference in 1910. The interest taken in the subject seemed to be sufficient to warrant further investigation. Three desiderata were named in the former paper: 1st. A checklist of farm papers in the agricultural libraries of the country; 2nd. An agreement by the various agricultural libraries that they would bind and preserve the papers published in their own states; 3rd. A selection of from 20 to 50 titles of the best and most representative of the farm journals.

In the spring of 1913 circular letters were sent to the directors of all the experiment stations and to the librarians of all the agricultural colleges. These letters frequently led to further correspondence, so that the writer is now in possession of a considerable body of correspondence bearing on this subject.

The questions asked were as follows:

1. Please state what, in your opinion, are the leading farm journals published in your state and those best adapted for your section of the country.
2. Furnish a list of the agricultural journals that are bound and preserved by your library, and if possible a statement of the volumes comprising each set.
3. Does your library systematically index any agricultural journals?
4. Do you know of any member of the college or station staff who keeps up a private index of such journals?
5. Do you consider that the indexing of a select list of agricultural journals would have any value?

Replies were received from one or more officials in 41 states, making possible some slight contributions to the first and third of the desiderata enumerated in 1910.

One thing is clearly demonstrated in the replies to the first question, namely, that the various sections of the country must be taken into consideration in any attempt to evaluate the farm press. For the New England and Middle Atlantic states the Rural New Yorker had a vote in every state. The South Atlantic and Gulf states gave the first place almost without exception to the Progressive Farmer. In the Corn Belt states Wallace's Farmer appears in every list. In the Mountain and Pacific states there is not the same unanimity, every state reporting its own papers with few exceptions. Of course there is considerable possibility of error in the various interpretations put upon the question asked, and further correspondence would be necessary in order to reach an accurate conclusion. In most cases also it would be necessary to reach the experts in the various fields of crops, live stock, poultry, dairying, etc., in order to get any reliable data on papers that specialize in these fields. Of course the Breeders' Gazette and Hoard's Dairyman appeared in many lists and from widely separated states.

The second question brought replies from only 14 states, listing 80 titles of farm papers exclusive of scientific journals. Of these 50 are reported from one library only. In addition to these, 62 foreign and scientific journals were reported.

The third question brought the statement from every state that no systematic indexing of farm papers was being done. Several professors were found who indexed material relating to their subject for their personal use.

The fifth question relating to the indexing of farm papers brought various replies, ranging from those who were heartily in favor of some plan to those who could see no value in such an index. Station directors who are interested in research rarely expressed approval, while librarians usually expressed a wish for such an index although fully aware of the difficulties in the way.

On this matter of the selection of farm papers some light is thrown by a most interesting booklet issued by the Northwestern Agriculturist, Minneapolis, entitled What Farmers Use. It has a section on "Farm home reading matter." The investigation was made in Minnesota, the Dakotas and Wisconsin, and covered 3,456 farm homes. Nine farm papers from these states had in 1910 a circulation of 4,891. Twenty-six papers published in border states had a circulation of 535 and 52 from other outside states a circulation of 579. This seems to show that as a means of reaching the farm population the state papers or those from the border states are preferred. Of the border state papers the leading ones were Successful Farming, Farmers' Tribune, Iowa Homestead, Breeders' Gazette, Wallace's Farmer. Of the papers from outside states the leading ones were Farm Journal, Farm & Home, Farm and Fireside, Missouri Valley Farmer.

Many of you will know the little paper called Good Advertising, which is devoted to the "art, science and literature of agricultural advertising." It frequently has very good articles on the farm press. Although considered from the standpoint of their value as advertising media, that is not, in these days, so far removed from their scientific value as to be lightly disregarded. In the issue for March, 1913, is given a list of class journals all of which are said to "stand out preëminently" and as "self-confessedly the masters of their particular destiny." These are Breeders' Gazette, Hoard's Dairyman, American Swineherd, American Sheep Breeder, Kimball's Dairy Farmer, the Fruit Grower, Better Fruit, the Fruit Belt, the Vegetable Grower, and the Practical Farmer. Probably none will be inclined to quarrel with this list except as to some it does not include.

In order that this paper may not be entirely one of dull generalities, I have the temerity to submit the following as a trial list of the leading farm papers based on the results so far obtained in the above investigation, the opinion of some qualified to judge and my own personal observation. They are not at all, however, in order of merit and it is not intended in any way to discriminate between them.

Rural New Yorker.
New York Tribune Farmer.
American Agriculturist.
Progressive Farmer.
Wallace's Farmer.
Farm and Ranch.
Country Gentleman.
Southern Planter.
Live Stock Journal.
Kimball's Dairy Farmer.
Breeders' Gazette.
Hoard's Dairyman.
American Swineherd.
American Sheep Breeder.
Better Fruit.
Vegetable Grower.
Reliable Poultry Journal.
American Poultry Journal.
Market Growers' Journal.
New York Produce Review.

As a contribution to a checklist of agricultural journals the "List of serials in the University of Illinois library, 1911" is worth mentioning. The Indiana Academy of Science will publish shortly the second edition of their "Checklist of scientific serials in Indiana libraries." This will include agricultural journals. They were not included in the first printing.

As Mr. H. W. Wilson of H. W. Wilson & Co. was present, he was called upon for a statement as to his plans for indexing agricultural periodicals. Mr. Wilson responded as follows:

We do have plans for undertaking an index to agricultural periodicals, although I am afraid there will be some delay in carrying these out. We lost about half of our assistants in the editorial office when we moved to White Plains. Then we took a vote recently among about 50 librarians to determine what special fields should be covered, and while we thought that agriculture stood first we found that there was most demand for an index to literature on social problems. It is quite likely that we will take that first but agriculture comes second.

I cannot set any definite time as to when the index will be published, but I feel quite sure that by the first of next year we will be ready to begin it, and our opinion is that it will be wise to cover the best periodicals, those that have a general or wide circulation, and government documents and pamphlets; in short, all literature of that kind which would properly be included in an index; it should not be limited to periodicals. We would like to receive suggestions and will try to answer any questions.

The public library's interest in agricultural literature was presented by Mr. S. H. Ranck, librarian of the Grand Rapids public library, and by Mr. Joseph F. Daniels, librarian of the Riverside public library, California, both of which libraries have large collections of agricultural literature. Mr. Ranck called attention to the fact that there is a constantly growing interest on the part of people in the cities in every phase of agriculture and that his library is frequently asked for advice as to the best periodicals and books on various agricultural subjects. The work of the county library, and its problems in getting agricultural information to the farmer in predigested form, was touched upon by Mr. E. I. Antrim, a trustee of the Brumback library of Van Wert county, Ohio. He also spoke of the need for the agricultural colleges and experiment stations to get into closer touch with the various libraries of the states that they represent in order that the information obtained by these institutions and by the Department of Agriculture as a result of their investigations may be brought directly to the farmers.

Mr. Antrim was followed by Dr. E. W. Allen, assistant director of the office of experiment stations of the Department of Agriculture. As it is one of Dr. Allen's duties to visit the state agricultural colleges and experiment stations, he has had an unusual opportunity to see the needs and opportunities of their libraries. He spoke in part as follows:

We have just started in this country a new line of extension work which will rapidly take on a much broader scope and will accomplish in a measure what has been suggested, for Congress has just passed an act known as the Smith-Lever bill, which will provide for agricultural extension in every state in the Union. Five per cent of the federal appropriation may be used for getting out popular publications. Some of the money will also be available for library purposes. A great deal of this extension work will be carried on through county agencies, a system which has already been inaugurated in many of the states in the North and South and has proved its usefulness. If we should have an agent in every county we would have some 3,000 centers in this country which might act as advisors to country libraries, because there is a great desire, as I know by correspondence which comes to me from city, town and country libraries, for available information as to publications relating to agriculture. The county agent makes a link, in a way, between the agricultural college and the people out in the country—of all classes and all vocations—librarians, teachers, housewives, etc., as well as farmers.

I know nothing about library work except from a layman's standpoint, but it has been my opportunity to go around to the agricultural colleges and stations several times and I have taken quite an interest in what they were doing in their agricultural libraries because the library becomes more and more an important feature in the work of instruction in the college and in the work of the experiment station. There is a great diversity and in many places a great lack of efficiency. I believe with your chairman that better work could be done. I believe that a librarian could be of greatest usefulness and could conserve the time of the investigators. I have sometimes thought that the field of the librarian in the experiment stations might be broadened a little by including some connection with the editing of publications. Librarians are trained to look at books from the standpoint of a finished product and their work has given them good judgment as to arrangement, etc. The matter of form and editing of the experiment station publications has been a matter for discussion at almost every meeting of the agricultural colleges and experiment stations for the past twenty years. If in connection with their other work it would not be a difficult matter for librarians to equip themselves along this line and give a little attention to the matter of proofreading, etc., I think they could be of immense assistance to the experiment stations in the better editing of station publications and in bringing about a greater measure of uniformity.

About this periodical literature, I think that the preparation of material for this agricultural extension work previously mentioned will call to the attention of all who are connected with agricultural colleges the problem of how to make available good material that is in some of the best agricultural periodicals and which deserves attention. Through the Experiment Station Record we attempt to make a systematic review of the literature bearing on experiments as far as we are able to get hold of it, and through the indexes to make that available, but we do not attempt to take up popular articles. If there is nothing new or original in the article we pass it by. The extension workers will on the other hand need somebody to go over the good popular material and to call it to their attention.

It seems to me that if some sort of coöperation such as has been mentioned here could be planned it would be immensely helpful all along the line.

In the discussion which followed Dr. Allen's talk there was much interest manifested in his suggestion as to the better editing of station publications and the part which librarians might take in this work. As a result a committee was appointed to undertake the work of making some definite suggestions in regard to the form of experiment station publications to present to the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations at its meeting in Washington in November. The following were appointed as members of the committee: Miss E. Lucy Ogden, librarian, office of experiment stations, Department of Agriculture; Mr. Charles R. Green, librarian, Massachusetts Agricultural College, and Mr. Clarence S. Hean, librarian of the College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Another matter which called forth interesting discussion was the question as to whether it would be advisable for the section to attempt to prepare a small handbook on the arrangement and care of small agricultural collections. It seemed to be the unanimous opinion of those present that such a handbook would be very useful, and it was voted that a committee be appointed by the chairman to consider the matter and prepare the handbook if it was deemed feasible. As it is important that those on the committee be especially interested in the subject, the chairman made a plea for volunteers for the work. Suggestions as to the scope of the handbook are also requested.

As the lateness of the hour made it necessary to bring the discussion to a close, the meeting adjourned with the appointment of the following committee to nominate a chairman for the next meeting of the section: Mr. Charles R. Green, chairman; Miss Emma B. Hawks, and Mr. A. B. Smith. The committee made its report at the close of the joint session of the League of Library Commissions and the Agricultural Libraries Section on Thursday morning and presented the name of Mrs. Ida A. Kidder, librarian of the Oregon Agricultural College, Corvallis. The report of the committee was unanimously accepted and Mrs. Kidder was made chairman of the section.